

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated November 26, 2003, an objection was made to the recitation of stearyl erucamide in claim 11 as unsupported by the specification. Instead, the specification uses the trademarked term Kemamide. In response, Applicant has amended to the specification to also recite the generic term for Kemamide. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added because the generic term for Kemamide is well known in the art. See http://www.infochems.com/index/product_inx.asp?inx=K

In addition, an objection was made to claim 25 as a substantial duplication of claim 24, being indefinite for stating "low vapor pressure" and having insufficient antecedent basis for "spin-on polymer". In response, Applicant has cancelled claim 25. Claim 13 has also been cancelled.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 7, 12-14 and 31-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chu, et al. (US 5,635,037). Applicant has amended claim 1 to read that the ejecting of liquid droplets onto the surface to be etched occurs while the surface to be etched is maintained below the freezing temperature of the phase change material. Chu does not do this. Instead, Chu cools the surface to a temperature below the melting point of indium after deposition of the indium layer. Chu, Col 6, lines 65-67. Cooling the substrate after deposition makes it more difficult to control spreading of the droplet. Claim 7, 12-14 and 31-32 depend on independent claim 1 and thus also include the limitation of depositing the liquid droplets while the surface to be etched is maintained below the freezing temperature of the phase change material.

In The Office Action, claims 26 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alwan (U.S. 5,695,658). Applicant respectfully disagrees. It is agreed that Alwan does not teach maintaining the substrate temperature above the boiling point of the liquid carrier as claimed. Instead, Alwan's statement that temperature and evaporation rate affect the drying rate of droplets are used to maintain that it would be obvious to boil the droplets. Applicant respectfully disagrees. A general statement that drying rate is a function of a number of variables including temperature, among others, is insufficient to create a prima facie case of obviousness that the substrate is maintained above a boiling temperature

during deposition. Thus Applicant respectfully submits that Alwan does not render obvious claim 26.

Objections were made to claims 2-6, 8-10, 15-18, 21, 28, and 29 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. In response, claims 2, and 8 have been rewritten in independent form. Claims 19-24 were previously allowed. All remaining claims depend on an independent claim that is believed to be allowable in view of the preceding amendments and remarks.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim as amended are allowable over the cited prior art reference, and allowance at Examiner's earliest convenience is hereby respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner believes a teleconference would facilitate prosecution, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Kent Chen
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 39,630
(310) 333-3663
March 25, 2004